

U.S.S.R.-Canada Protocol

Mention has been made by the Prime Minister of representations he made on behalf of people in Canada whose ancestry goes back to the Ukraine and to Russia. I have received representations from such groups. I went to school with the children of those people, know many of their families and have some idea of what it is all about. If the Prime Minister was able to make representations which may make things a little easier for them, I for one will be very pleased.

As Canadians, we must take the view that we are being realistic when we expand our relations with other countries through contact and consultation. When he was attempting to become President of the United States I remember Wendell Wilkie saying that we would have one world or no world. Of course, that is an absolute statement and probably not all that profound. But certainly we will have to learn to live together, particularly with the present state of technology in the world. We have no other alternative. Aneurin Bevan, the great British Socialist, in his book "In Place of Fear" published after the war—about 1946 or 1947—said it would be essential to the peace and welfare of the peoples of the world that contacts and working relationships be established between the two great ideologies which had emerged from the nineteenth century and which had taken up opposing positions after the Second World War. He was quite right; we did not do it. Instead, we went into opposing positions and have carried it through almost up to this time.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We cannot claim that the process has been an outstanding success but surely through gradual contact with other peoples we might learn to tolerate what we cannot accept because that is the only alternative. We certainly will not be prepared to accept the ideologies and the form of government of all other peoples in the world any more than they will be prepared to accept ours.

The war in Viet Nam, which has been carried on with terrible ferocity for many years, has not succeeded in changing anything. It has caused the death of a great many people and has devastated the countryside, but it has not convinced the people over there to change their ways. We have to recognize the facts. Times change, and it may happen that over the years we can find better ways of developing human relations throughout the world. Wendell Wilkie and Aneurin Bevan held two entirely different philosophies but they agreed that we must develop ways to live together. It must be the hope of people that we can do so.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes remaining I should like to ask some questions in connection with the very successful trip just completed by our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). First of all, I should like to welcome him back. While I have not had much personal experience, I am told that travelling through many time zones is exceedingly tiring. I hope the "awkward squad" he left behind to look after things in Ottawa has not got them in such a mess that he will not

[Mr. Gleave.]

be able to have a weekend of rest before being involved in affairs of state.

Any right-thinking person would applaud efforts to broaden the scope of personal and national contacts. This afternoon the Prime Minister mentioned things which are worth while—the exchange of information relative to Arctic technology, including navigation, prevention of pollution, exchange of educational and cultural ideas and increased trade. All this is a step in the right direction, but I submit that most of these things are already in effect. They were in effect before signing this protocol. Over the years Russia had loosened travel restrictions. We had trade relations with them and they bought products from us when it was in their interests to do so. We were getting along fairly well and situations were improving. But we were dealing, as I suggest we should, at arms length which was not a bad thing. We have not really accomplished anything new. The Prime Minister mentioned fishing, and that is fine. Representatives of the Soviet Union have been sitting in on the discussions at Halifax, so this is an improvement.

The question uppermost in the minds of most Canadians is, who instigated this protocol? Was it the Russians or was it Canada? I think this is important, but we have never been told. Who started negotiations, and who stands to gain? I think all Canadians were delighted that the Prime Minister was so warmly welcomed in Russia. I hope it was a genuine demonstration of affection, but remembering events as recent as those of 1968 in Prague I cannot quite accept that. I sincerely hope that I am proven wrong but I have a nagging suspicion that this great event may have been largely staged in order to embarrass and drive a further wedge between Canada and our closest and sincerest friend.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCutcheon: I mean our NATO allies, and in particular the United States of America.

Mr. Sharp: That is nonsense, sheer fabrication.

Mr. McCutcheon: I cannot forget that the stated Soviet foreign policy is to discredit the United States of America in the eyes of the world. Sincerely, Mr. Speaker—and I cannot stress this too much—I hope that we have not been hoodwinked.

An hon. Member: Yes, we have.

Mr. McCutcheon: Let me refer for a moment to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the treaty, which I should like to read into the record:

2. In the event of a situation arising which, in the opinion of the two governments, endangers the maintenance of peace or involves a breach of the peace, the two governments will make contact without delay in order to exchange views on what might be done to improve the situation.

3. The provisions set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 above do not affect obligations previously assumed by the parties in respect of third states and are not directed against any of them.

This simply means that nothing Canada has to say will have any effect on the behaviour of the U.S.S.R. or her